But, it may be said, the fault lies with the cultivator to some extent. Land is cultivated in a primitive way, with very small holdings. The peasant is unscientific and his bad social customs increase his poverty. These things are often said and I myself have often been guilty of saying them. They will not survive examination. Nor will any attempt to lay the blame on nature or the increase of population. Let us examine these points for a moment.

If the yield per acre is less in India than elsewhere, it must be remembered that the soil has been producing from time immemorial. In the Punjab, newly recovered lands give a larger yield per acre than lands in U.P., despite inferior methods of cultivation. Land in New Zealand and U.S.A., for example, gives a higher yield because it has been brought under the plough in comparatively recent times. It is worth noting that the average yield of wheat and rice is far greater in India than Mexico, and compares well with other countries.

Again, when increased pressure upon the land causes the cultivator to turn to inferior soil, this will reduce the average yield. Irrigation facilities are only available to 16 per cent, of the total area cultivated. Were this not the case, the yield would be higher. It is not within the control of the cultivator in most cases to increase the yield. But a far more important fact is that increased yield will not, under existing economic conditions, improve the lot of the Kisan. In many countries it has not been found profitable to increase agriculture. One may refer to the burning of crops in more than one country and the artificial limitation of production (e.g. the marketing boards i» England and such control as the limiting of the size and weight of potatoes, etc.). In 1932 there was a bumper crop of sugar cane in U.P. and the prices of raw sugar *(gur)* went down from 4 rupees to i rupee 10 annas a maund, a price never heard of before.